

change is what we should expect.

Evidently, the value of developing the nonfossil sources of energy is at least as great as it would have been under a regime of fossil-fuel restriction and, if anything, more valuable.

Are there long lead-time projects or policies that need now to be adapted to the prospects of changing climates? Water resources and related technology may have lead times of half a century; water is therefore a candidate for planning in a context of potential climate change. As forecasts for climate change become clearer, there may be strong indications for research and development related to agriculture, fisheries, and pests. Military planning will probably be alert to changes on land and sea. Certainly coastal planning should be affected by forecasts of rising sea levels. But nothing urgent is foreseeable yet.

The foreseeable consequences of climate change are no cause for alarm on a global scale but could prove to be exceedingly bad news for particular parts of the world. Generally, the more well-to-do countries can take in stride what may prove to be a reduction (probably not noticeable as such) by a few percent in living standards that will likely be greater per capita by more than 100% over today's. But one has to question whether this relatively calm assessment can be applied to a country, say Bangladesh, where food production is already at the margin of subsistence and coastal flooding is already serious. Is it an especial hardship for the people of Bangladesh that the nations on whom would depend any permanent regime for globally rationing the use of fossil fuels in the interest of stable climate are unable to take a long economic view and to reconcile intense political differences?